

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for his report. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the application.

Claim 1, 8, 9, 14-16, 21 and 24 have been amended. Claim 17-19 are canceled.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C § 102(e)

In his report, the Examiner rejects claims 1-10, 14-19, 21, 22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maggenti (US 6,633,765), hereinafter referred to as Maggenti. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 now relates to a method of updating radio network data in a plurality of devices deployed in a Base Station (BS) in a radio telecommunications network. Through an IP network, the BS is interfaced with a Mobile Switching Center (MSC). The BS is assigned an IP address. The IP address is used by the MSC to send device update data to the BS (21) in an IP message. Upon reception of the IP message, the BS updates at least one of the plurality of devices.

Maggenti describes how end terminals or Wireless Communication Devices (WDC) of a cellular network can determine which multicast group other WDC are receiving or would like to receive (column 3, lines 27-37). Maggenti shows that the WDC can be assigned an IP address generally for short period of time (column 8, lines 6-11). Maggenti shows base station connecting the WDC to the cellular network. The base stations of Maggenti are connected to a mobile switching center (MSC) through well-known techniques (column 8, lines 36-38), which involve ordinary cellular links (e.g. SS7). The teachings of Maggenti are directed to interaction between WDC through multicast messages instead of multiplying the individual messages, thereby limiting the wasted bandwidth and network resource usage.

As can be appreciated, Maggenti does not mention that bases station can deploy one or more devices comprising radio network data. Furthermore, the bases stations in Maggenti are not connected in an IP network and, as a consequence, cannot be part of

one or more multicast group. The known techniques (column 8, lines 36-38) for interfacing an MSC to a base station does not encompass using an IP network, as in the present invention. Furthermore, the IP address mentioned in Maggenti are assigned to end terminals and not to the base stations (column 8, lines 6-11). Therefore, no IP message can be sent from the MSC to the base station as is the case in the present invention. Even if base stations were to be connected via an IP network to the MSC, Maggenti still would not mention devices deployed in the base station and, consequently, would not provide any way of providing device update data from the MSC to the base station to update devices therein.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1. Since claims 2 to 16 depend ultimately from claim 1, the same reasoning can be brought in their favor. Consequently, confirmation of their patentability is also requested.

Arguments similar could also be brought in favor of independent claims 21, which relates to an IP base station and of independent claim 24, which is a method similar to the one of claim 1 expect that an IP address is assigned to devices deployed in the base station instead of the base station itself. As mentioned previously, the concept of an IP base station and of devices deployed in a base station is not mentioned in Maggenti.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 21 and 24. Since claims 22 depends ultimately from claim 21 and claims 25 depends ultimately from claim 24, confirmation of their patentability is also requested.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103(a)

Claims 11-13, 20, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggenti in view of Harsch (US 6,212,175).

While Harsch mentions that User Datagram Protocol (UDP) is related to IP, it does not teach how those concepts can be applied to updating radio network data in a plurality of devices deployed in a base station. Moreover, all claims rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) are dependent on independent claims previously discussed.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 11-13, 20, 23 and 26.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for favorable action.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss the present amendment or present patent application, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (514) 345-7891.

Respectfully submitted

Date: May 7, 2004

S. Beauchesne

Sandra Beauchesne,

Reg. No. 43,422